



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/766,651	01/27/2004	Ronald A. Beyerinck	PC23195B	4574
28523 7550 03/04/2009				
PFIZER INC. PATENT DEPARTMENT, MS8260-1611 EASTERN POINT ROAD GROTON, CT 06340				
EXAMINER				
SASAN, ARADHANA				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1615				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
03/04/2009		ELECTRONIC		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

-IPGSGro@pfizer.com

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/766,651

**Applicant(s)**

BEYERINCK ET AL.

**Examiner**

ARADHANA SASAN

**Art Unit**

1615

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 November 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 22-26, 30, 34-37 and 39-43 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 22-26, 30, 34-37 and 39-43 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Status of Application***

1. The remarks, amendments, and Request for Continued Examination filed on 11/25/08 are acknowledged.
2. Claims 1-21 were withdrawn.
3. Claims 27-29, and 31-33 were cancelled.
4. Claims 22-26, 30, 34-37, and 39-43 are included in the prosecution.

***Continued Examination under 37 CFR 1.114***

5. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 11/25/08 has been entered.

***Response to Arguments***

**Rejection of claims 22-25, 30, 34-37, and 39-43 under 35 USC § 103(a)**

6. In light of Applicant's amendments, filed 11/25/08, the rejection of claims 22-25, 30, 34-37, and 39-43 under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Illum (WO 96/41632) in view of Chang et al. (US 6,121,283) and further in view of Nakamichi et al. (US 5,456,923) and Gombotz et al. (US 5,019,400) has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Babcock et al. (US 2001/0053791 A1).

**Rejection of claim 26 under 35 USC § 103(a)**

7. In light of Applicant's amendments, filed 11/25/08, the rejection of claim 26 under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Illum (WO 96/41632) in view of Chang et al. (US 6,121,283) has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Babcock et al. (US 2001/0053791 A1).

**New Rejections**

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

8. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

9. Claims 35, and 40-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The terms "at least about" (claim 35), and "less than about" (claims 40-43), are relative terms, which render the claims indefinite. The terms "at least about", and "less than about" are not defined by the claim, the specification does not provide a standard for ascertaining the requisite degree, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention.

Please see MPEP 2173.05(b).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

10. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

11. Claims 22-26, 30, 34-37, and 39-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Babcock et al. (US 2001/0053791 A1).

12. Claims 22-26, 30, 34-37, and 39-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Babcock et al. (US 2001/0053791 A1).

The applied reference has a common assignee with the instant application. Based upon the earlier effective U.S. filing date of the reference, it constitutes prior art under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). This rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) might be overcome either by a showing under 37 CFR 1.132 that any invention disclosed but not claimed in the reference was derived from the inventor of this application and is thus not the invention "by another," or by an appropriate showing under 37 CFR 1.131.

The claimed invention is a composition comprising a plurality of solid amorphous dispersion particles comprising a substantially amorphous drug and a polymer selected from the group consisting of hydroxypropyl methyl cellulose acetate succinate, hydroxypropyl methyl cellulose phthalate, cellulose acetate phthalate, cellulose acetate trimellitate, polyvinyl alcohols that have at least a portion of their repeat units in hydrolyzed form, polyvinyl pyrrolidone, poloxamers, and blends thereof. The particles have an average diameter of at least 40  $\mu\text{m}$  and a bulk specific volume of less than 5 mL/g. At least 80 vol % of the particles have diameters of greater than 10  $\mu\text{m}$ . The

particles are formed by a spray drying process, the process comprising the steps (a) forming a feed solution comprising the drug, the polymer, and a solvent " in which both the drug and the polymer are soluble; (b) directing the feed solution to a spray-drying apparatus; (c) atomizing the feed solution into droplets in the spray-drying apparatus; and (d) contacting the droplets with a drying gas to form the particles.

Babcock teaches spray drying as a process that breaks up liquid mixtures into small droplets (atomization) and rapidly removing solvent from the mixtures in a vessel such as a spray-drying apparatus where there is a strong driving force for evaporation of solvent from the droplets (Page 6, [0063]). "In the case of spray-drying, the droplets generally dry prior to impinging on a surface, thus forming particles of solid amorphous dispersion on the order of 1 to 200 micrometers in diameter ... For example, a solution of drug and a dispersion polymer such as HPMCAS in acetone may be suitably spray-dried by spraying the solution at a temperature of 50.degree. C. (the vapor pressure of acetone at 50° C is about 0.8 atm) into a chamber held at 0.01 to 0.2 atm total pressure by connecting the outlet to a vacuum pump. Alternatively, such a solution may be sprayed into a chamber where it is mixed with nitrogen gas at a temperature of 80°C to 250°C and pressure of 1.0 to 1.2 atm" (Pages 6-7, [0063]).

Regarding instant claim 22, the limitation of a composition comprising a plurality of solid amorphous dispersion particles comprising a substantially amorphous drug and a polymer selected from the group consisting of hydroxypropyl methyl cellulose acetate succinate, hydroxypropyl methyl cellulose phthalate, cellulose acetate phthalate, cellulose acetate trimellitate, polyvinyl alcohols that have at least a portion of their

repeat units in hydrolyzed form, polyvinyl pyrrolidone, poloxamers, and blends thereof is anticipated by the particles of solid amorphous dispersion comprising a drug and a dispersion polymer such as HPMCAS, as taught by Babcock (Pages 6-7, [0063]). The limitation of the particles having an average diameter of at least 40  $\mu\text{m}$  and the limitation of at least 80 vol % of the particles having diameters of greater than 10  $\mu\text{m}$  are anticipated by the particles that are on the order of 1 to 200 micrometers in diameter, as taught by Babcock (Pages 6-7, [0063]). The limitation a bulk specific volume of less than 5 mL/g is a property of the particles that is inseparable from the particles. Babcock teaches the components of the composition (the drug, the polymer, and the solvent), the particle size (1-200 $\mu\text{m}$ ), and the process by which the particles are prepared (preparing a solution of the drug and polymer in the solvent, spray-drying the solution). Therefore, the bulk specific volume (which is calculated by dividing a known volume of particles by the weight of the particles) is anticipated by the teaching of Babcock, absent any evidence of criticality. The limitations of the spray drying process are anticipated by the spray drying process taught by Babcock (Pages 6-7, [0063]).

Regarding instant claim 23, the limitation of at least 90 vol % of the particles having diameters of greater than 10 $\mu\text{m}$  is anticipated by the particles that are on the order of 1 to 200 micrometers in diameter, as taught by Babcock (Pages 6-7, [0063]).

Regarding instant claim 24, the limitation of the particles having an average diameter of at least 50 $\mu\text{m}$  is anticipated by the particles that are on the order of 1 to 200 micrometers in diameter, as taught by Babcock (Pages 6-7, [0063]).

Regarding instant claim 25, the limitation of a bulk specific volume of less than 4 mL/g is a property of the particles that is inseparable from the particles. Babcock teaches the components of the composition (the drug, the polymer, and the solvent), the particle size (1-200 $\mu$ m), and the process by which the particles are prepared (preparing a solution of the drug and polymer in the solvent, spray-drying the solution) (Pages 6-7, [0062] – [0063] and Page 9, [0086]). Therefore, the bulk specific volume (which is calculated by dividing a known volume of particles by the weight of the particles) is anticipated by the teaching of Babcock, absent any evidence of criticality.

Regarding instant claim 26, the limitation of the drug is anticipated by the glycogen phosphorylase inhibitor taught by Babcock (Page 1, [0001] – [0002]).

Regarding instant claim 30, the limitation of the hydroxypropyl methyl cellulose acetate succinate is anticipated by the hydroxypropyl methyl cellulose acetate succinate (HPMCAS) taught by Babcock (Page 5, [0050] and Pages 6-7, [0063]).

Regarding instant claim 34, the limitation of the polymer that is present in an amount sufficient such that the solid amorphous dispersion, following administration to an *in vivo* or *in vitro* use environment, provides concentration enhancement of the drug in the use environment relative to a control composition consisting essentially of an equivalent amount of the drug alone is anticipated by combining Drug A (a GPI (glycogen phosphorylase inhibitor)) with sufficient amount of concentration-enhancing polymer to meet the *in vivo* or *in vitro* requirements, as taught by Babcock (Page 11, [0106]).



Regarding instant claim 35, the limitation of the composition providing a maximum drug concentration of the drug in the use environment that is at least about 1.25-fold that provided by the control composition is anticipated by the C<sub>max</sub> of Drug A that is at least 1.25-fold that of a control composition, as taught by Babcock (Page 1, [0004]).

Regarding instant claim 36, the limitation of the composition providing in the use environment an area under the drug concentration versus time curve for any 90- minute period from the time of introduction to about 270 minutes following introduction to the use environment that is at least 1.25-fold that provided by the control composition is anticipated by an in vitro dissolution test reflected by a plot of dissolved Drug A concentration versus time the compositions of the present invention provide an Area Under the Curve (AUC) for any period of at least 90 minutes between the time of introduction into the use environment and about 270 minutes following introduction that is at least 1.25-fold that of a control composition comprising an equivalent quantity of Drug A alone, as taught by Babcock (Page 3, [0029]).

Regarding instant claim 37, the limitation of the composition providing a relative bioavailability of the drug that is at least 1.25-fold that of the control composition is anticipated by the relative bioavailability of Drug A is achieved that is at least 1.25 compared to a control of amorphous Drug A alone, as taught by Babcock (Page 11, [0106]).

Regarding instant claims 39-41, the limitations of the average droplet diameter, D<sub>10</sub> and D<sub>90</sub> are anticipated by the droplet size of 1-200μm, as taught by Babcock

(Pages 6-7, [0063]). Babcock teaches the components of the composition (the drug, the polymer, and the solvent), the particle size (1-200 $\mu$ m), and the process by which the particles are prepared (preparing a solution of the drug and polymer in the solvent, spray-drying the solution). The average droplet diameter,  $D_{10}$ , and  $D_{90}$  are properties that are inseparable from the droplets taught by Babcock, absent any evidence of criticality. "Products of identical chemical composition can not have mutually exclusive properties." A chemical composition and its properties are inseparable. Therefore, if the prior art teaches the identical chemical structure, the properties applicant discloses and/or claims are necessarily present. (MPEP 2112.01).

Regarding instant claims 42-43, the limitations of the span of the droplets are anticipated by the droplet size of 1-200 $\mu$ m, as taught by Babcock (Pages 6-7, [0063]). Babcock teaches the components of the composition (the drug, the polymer, and the solvent), the particle size (1-200 $\mu$ m), and the process by which the particles are prepared (preparing a solution of the drug and polymer in the solvent, spray-drying the solution). The span of the droplets is a property that is inseparable from the droplets taught by Babcock, absent any evidence of criticality. "Products of identical chemical composition can not have mutually exclusive properties." A chemical composition and its properties are inseparable. Therefore, if the prior art teaches the identical chemical structure, the properties applicant discloses and/or claims are necessarily present. (MPEP 2112.01).

### ***Double Patenting***

13. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

14. Claims 22-26, 30, 34-37, and 39-43 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-25 of U.S. Patent No. 6,973,741 B2 (the '741 patent). Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because although claims 1-24 of the '741 patent are drawn to a process for producing a pharmaceutical composition, claim 25 is directed to a product of the process of any of claims 1-24. Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art would find instant composition claims (independent claim 22 is a product by process claim) obvious over the claims of the '741 patent and thus they are not patentably distinct over each other.

***Conclusion***

15. No claims are allowed.
16. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Aradhana Sasan whose telephone number is (571) 272-9022. The examiner can normally be reached Monday to Thursday from 6:30 am to 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Woodward, can be reached at 571-272-8373. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Aradhana Sasan/  
Examiner, Art Unit 1615

/MP WOODWARD/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1615